



# **East Land Quality Forum: Improving Standards Workshop Report**

**May 2012**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 16<sup>th</sup> May 2012, twenty seven members of the East Land Quality Forum (ELQF) met to discuss the quality of written reports and professional standards within the contaminated land industry. These topics had been highlighted by EQLF members during previous events as pitfalls and problem areas that either directly or indirectly affect their work.

The purpose of the workshop was to identify and evaluate some key characteristics of each topic and to develop potential future actions for the ELQF Steering Committee (and individual members if so inclined) to pursue at a later date through future meetings and discussion forums.

The delegates were split into four groups; two that discussed the quality of written reports and conceptual site models, and two that discussed professional standards. The groups debated for approximately 90 minutes before meeting as a whole for a further 90 minutes to hear feedback from each group and hold open discussions amongst all attendees. Notes were taken by a member of each group so that this report could be developed by the steering committee

Those involved in reviewing reports stated that there was a wide variety in the quality of reports submitted to them however further discussion found that whilst some of the quality aspects were entirely down to technical detail, others related to reporting formats and styles which appeared to be related to the differing objectives of authors and readers.

Of the subjective aspects discussed, the use of numerous caveats within reports, the reliance on standardised templates, and the absence of an executive summary or reporting objectives were considered by the groups as the most common areas affecting quality.

It was suggested that a cross-industry checklist for report content could provide a means to improve reporting quality.

The group discussion on professional standards centred around the theme of competency and how best to measure and assess it. The groups discussed the possible development and use of a standard code of practice and how this might be received and operated by the industry.

Professional memberships were also discussed, which may represent a means to demonstrate competency and professionalism however areas of disagreement were highlighted around cost, relevance and requirement. It was also noted that a minimum level of professional standards is influence by developers, who are commonly absent from contaminated land forums.

# CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background to the Workshop .....	1
1.2 The Purpose of the Workshop.....	1
1.3 The Structure of the Workshop.....	1
2. Discussion Session – Improving the Quality of Reports .....	3
2.1 Introduction.....	3
2.2 Objectives .....	3
2.3 Discussion Groups .....	3
2.4 Discussion Points .....	4
3. Discussion Session – Improving Professional Standards .....	7
3.1 Introduction.....	7
3.2 Objectives .....	7
3.3 Discussion Groups .....	7
3.4 Discussion Points .....	8
4. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS.....	12
4.1 Report Quality.....	12
4.2 Professional Standards .....	13
5. PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE .....	14
Annex 1: List of Attendees .....	1
Annex 2: Copy of the Presentation .....	1

---

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background to the Workshop

During ELQF's meeting on 27 March 2012 written suggestions we're sought via an open question on a feedback form as to what pitfalls and problems members felt were important issues for them in their work. Based on 58 respondents the following broad areas / topics were identified.

34%	Science issues, especially risk assessment
24%	Report quality, especially conceptual site model development and use
17%	Interpretation of legislation and regulations
10%	Experience / competence of practitioners
10%	Duplication and gaps between regulators
5%	Waste Management Mistakes

Based on these broad categories of feedback the ELQF Steering Committee identified a number of themes for a workshop which was held on 16 May 2012 and through which it could explore these issues in a more interactive environment, so that individuals and the ELQF could better understand them as a whole but also to help plan out future meetings with members needs in mind. Three themes were initially identified as follows:

- Report Quality
- Professional Standards
- Communication

Communication was dropped as a topic on the day due to a number of registered delegates failing to attend. Without this adjustment it was felt that the remaining breakout groups would have been too small / thinly spread to sustain lively discussion.

## 1.2 The Purpose of the Workshop

The purpose of the Workshop was to explore the topics of Report Quality and Professional Standards as we currently experience them, and thereby to identify key characteristics of each and potential future actions for the ELQF Steering Committee (and individual members if so inclined) to pursue at a later date through future meetings and discussion forums.

## 1.3 The Structure of the Workshop

On 16 May 2012, 27 members of the ELQF gathered at British Sugar's Holmewood Hall, near Peterborough, to participate in the above workshop. After initial introductions we divided up into four groups based upon our two key themes, as follows:

- Improving Report Quality – Red and Green Groups
- Improving Professional Standards - Blue and Orange Groups

After discussion within our individual groups for approximately 90 minutes we then reconvened the meeting as a whole for a further 90 minutes and heard feedback from each group, after which we held an open discussion amongst all attendees.

Notes were taken by a nominated member of each group and then handed to the steering group for collation into the final report.

## **2. DISCUSSION SESSION – IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF REPORTS**

### **2.1 Introduction**

A ‘good report’ might be described as one that *does what it says it was going to do*, on *time* and in *budget* but how does this work in practice, who or what is a report ‘good’ for and what do these terms really mean when tough decisions have to be made on the back of advice given in a report? We know that conceptual site models are a key component of a good report and so a good CSM is also key but how does it all link together?

The following sections provide a summary of the points raised by ELQF members attending the workshop on 16<sup>th</sup> May during their discussions around these questions.

### **2.2 Objectives**

The intention for the group discussion on improving the quality of reports was to capture ideas and views expressed by delegates involved in the contaminated land industry through lively and informative discussions around the following example topics and questions:

- What’s the first thing we all do when picking up a report to read?
- What simple / practical tests might we apply when reading a report to build confidence?
- There are many different ways to write a report but what are the common themes?
- Is the way we write a report the same way we read a report, and if not should it be?
- How do we ensure that our reports are suitable for use?
- What differentiates a good Conceptual Site Model (CSM) from a bad one?
- How do we make sure that our CSM is realistic without being alarmist?
- How do we reflect a lack of data and information in our CSM?
- How do we address uncertainty within a CSM or do we treat all linkages equally?
- Should the way we compile a CSM influence the way we present it?
- What might be another name for a CSM?

### **2.3 Discussion Groups**

Two groups discussed the quality of reports, the first consisted of the following ELQF delegates:

<b>Gavin</b>	<b>Allsopp</b>	<b>NHBC (ELQF)</b>
<b>Murray</b>	<b>Bateman</b>	<b>Lister Geotechnics</b>
<b>Trevor</b>	<b>Dixon</b>	<b>South Northants Council</b>
<b>Shaun</b>	<b>Wedgewood</b>	<b>Augean PLC</b>
<b>Claire</b>	<b>Sproats</b>	<b>South Cambridgeshire District Council (Group Speaker)</b>
<b>Nicola</b>	<b>Todd</b>	<b>Corby Borough Council</b>

The second group was made up of the following:

<b>Alex</b>	<b>Brearley</b>	<b>AGB Environmental Ltd (ELQF)</b>
<b>Fabia</b>	<b>Pollard</b>	<b>BC King's Lynn &amp; West Norfolk</b>
<b>Keith</b>	<b>Jones</b>	<b>Chemtest Ltd</b>
<b>Andy</b>	<b>McParland</b>	<b>Health Protection Agency (Group Speaker)</b>
<b>Alex</b>	<b>Gratrix</b>	<b>Kettering Borough Council</b>
<b>Martin</b>	<b>Stride</b>	<b>Pick Everard</b>
<b>Amanda</b>	<b>David</b>	<b>Listers Geotechnical Consultants</b>

## 2.4 Discussion Points

### 2.4.1 Report Quality

Both groups began by discussing what might be described as a 'Good Report' and the following points and observations were made:

- Inclusion of an Executive Summary is an important and useful part of a report due to time restrictions. Regulators start with the executive summary and the conclusions to assess whether further time is needed to read the report in greater detail.
- Consultants in the group did not appreciate the importance of an executive summary to the regulators.
- Most regulators either had a checklist of what would should be present; these included historical site uses, geology, hydrogeology, conceptual site model, and conclusions etc.
- Some local authority representatives identified that it was relatively rare that a report had to be rejected due to it being unfit for purpose. However, questions and discussions around reports did regularly occur.
- A good report should be up to date with current guidance, which should take account of a number of regulatory changes in the past few years.
- A report should include basic details for contacting the consultant to allow discussion, which was considered an essential part of any quality report.
- Some delegates stated that good reports should clearly set out their objectives, and ensure that the concluding remarks demonstrate how the report has met those objectives. However other delegates pointed out that reports can have multiple objectives for multiple audiences that may each have different desired outcomes from the report.
- A good report needs to be written for all potential audiences – client, regulators, and members of the public.

- Consultants and companies can often use standard formats. These can be good provided that they have a clear structure; regulators amongst the group pointed out that relevant departments need to be able to find what they need easily.
- Comments were made that substandard reports often use subjective terms such as “only” or “slightly” to sidestep appropriate risk assessment and justification through lines of evidence.
- Good reports provide a coherent approach utilising the Pollutant Linkage approach (Source – Pathway – Receptor) to build the CSM.
- Regulators noted that many companies and contaminated land practitioners operating in their areas had a reputation as either good or bad based upon the quality of their reports.
- A report containing too many caveats can be off-putting to some readers.

#### **2.4.2 Conceptual Site Model (CSM)**

In discussing what makes a ‘good’ conceptual site model, the following points and observations were raised:

- A good CSM should be a clear and uncluttered; it should not try and show everything, only the relevant potential pollutant linkages.
- Previous Uses – Checked all relevant information sources.
- Someone has engaged with the report e.g. knows the site. Has not just reviewed the landmark reports to make their appraisal of the site.
- Acknowledges and discusses the level of uncertainty associated with the CSM/ Pollutant linkages.
- It should reflect the proposed end use.
- A poor CSM is generally the result of:
  - No walkover survey (the person making the assessment has never been to the site).
  - A lack of thought/understanding – the CSM does not reflect information gathered during desk study or site investigation.
  - The source/ pathway/ receptor and resultant pollutant linkages have not been considered
  - Pollutant linkages are not clear.

#### **2.4.3 Other Factors Affecting the Quality of Reporting:**

- Contaminated land practitioners that keep up to date with current legislation, technical guidance or ‘good practice’ through subscriptions, meetings and forums such as the ELQF are unlikely to produce reports that are unfit for purpose.

- If reporting standards are to be raised across the industry, action may need to be directed towards those who do not attend events such as those organised by the ELQF. This may be achieved by ELQF and similar groups supporting LAs in taking decisions on rejecting substandard reports.
- Those who produce “poor” reports, which are then accepted by regulators are potentially being handed an unfair competitive advantage, which may perpetuate the problem. It was suggested that regulators are, essentially, the custodians of the standards relating to land quality, though this is to be considered a partnership with industry (through groups such as ELQF).
- Most parties involved in the group discussions showed a preference towards open lines of communication between the regulator, the client and the consultant.
- It was agreed by the Group that the workshop format was very constructive, it promoted useful and interesting, cross sector discussions. It was suggested that consideration be given to the inclusion of local developers or landowners in any future events.

### **3. DISCUSSION SESSION – IMPROVING PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

Contaminated land professionals have a number of options when seeking accreditation and recognition but to what extent do these engender professionalism or is there something more at stake when we talk of professional standards?

The National Planning Policy Framework states that a competent person should undertake a site investigation. With environmental permitting within the waste industry they need to be competent and though the new CL:AIRE Waste Code of Practice they need to be a qualified person. The backgrounds of individuals in land quality is huge with hundreds of different scientific degrees available in environmental, engineering and scientific disciplines. In addition to this as people progress through their careers there are at least seven different professional bodies that you can become chartered with. However, do qualifications and chartership demonstrate professionalism and include everyone within our industry. We wanted to explore the current situation and whether any improvements can be made.

The following sections provide a summary of the points raised by the ELQF members attending the workshop on 16<sup>th</sup> May in discussing professional standards in the industry.

#### **3.2 Objectives**

The intention for the group discussions on improving professional standards was to capture ideas and views expressed by delegates involved in lively and informative discussions around the following example topics and questions:

- What do we expect from others when seeking professional advice?
- To what extent do professional standards depend upon understanding legislation?
- What questions do we ask of ourselves and others when giving and receiving advice?
- Where does our professional identity come from and how do we develop it?
- What does accreditation mean?
- In a world full of so called experts what does accreditation mean?
- How do we safeguard in the long term what we value today?
- Professional standard or professionalism – is there a difference?
- What motivates us to be professionals in the first place?
- What do we expect from other professionals when we seek advice?
- Are these standards reflected in our own work?
- Is a professional standard an absolute standard?

#### **3.3 Discussion Groups**

Two groups discussed improving professional standards, the first consisted of the following ELQF delegates:

<b>Alison</b>	<b>Hukin</b>	<b>Environment Agency (ELQF)</b>
<b>Peter</b>	<b>Atchison</b>	<b>PAGeotechnical ltd</b>
<b>Eric</b>	<b>Cooper</b>	<b>Hydrock Consultants</b>
<b>Julie</b>	<b>Ewers</b>	<b>South Northants Council</b>
<b>Lisa</b>	<b>Hathway</b>	<b>NHBC (Group Speaker)</b>
<b>Andy</b>	<b>Spetch</b>	<b>British Sugar</b>
<b>Ruth</b>	<b>Copeland-Phillips</b>	<b>Northampton University</b>

The second group was made up of the following:

<b>Mandy</b>	<b>Dennis</b>	<b>East Northamptonshire Council (ELQF)</b>
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Baker</b>	<b>Independent Environmental consultant</b>
<b>Kevin</b>	<b>Eaton</b>	<b>MJCA (Group Speaker)</b>
<b>David</b>	<b>Grant</b>	<b>ALcontrol Laboratories</b>
<b>Matthew</b>	<b>Paddock</b>	<b>Trendrevel Services Limited</b>
<b>Marian</b>	<b>Markham</b>	<b>Halcrow Group Ltd</b>
<b>Callum</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>LBH WEMBLEY Geotechnical &amp; Environmental</b>

### **3.4 Discussion Points**

#### **3.4.1 Professionalism**

The groups discussed a number of different topics within the professional standards workshop and the following points and observations were made in respect of ‘professionalism’:

- The discussions established that ‘Professionalism’ is generally based upon:
  1. Experience
  2. Professional Qualifications
  3. Following the relevant guidance
- Experience encompassed making the appropriate judgements based on One’s experience.
- Professionalism needed verification through an assessment of competency, which is based on:
  - Academic Qualifications
  - Professional Experience
- Recent changes to industry regulation (such as with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Part 2A) refer to competency in some form, as a requirement.
- The delegates also noted that the recent regulatory and policy changes uphold the recent shift away from central regulation towards Self Regulation. Good

examples include ‘The Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice’.

- Other professions including Environmental Health and Civil Engineering and noted that a requirement to become ‘Chartered’ under these routes, have frameworks for training and competency.
- Some of the group noted that clients require reports to be reviewed and signed off by a SiLC.
- Hydrock and NHBC noted that it was a requirement in both organisations for individuals to be appropriately ‘chartered’ and a framework existed in each organisation for this.
- The EA outlined their competency framework, which included having an appropriate scientific first degree as a pre-requisite. The competency framework also supports progression through CIWEM and GeolSoc. The EA support staff being chartered.
- A further comment was made in respect of PI cover. This should also be a significant driver behind raising professional standards. It was noted that it is a requirement in some industries that appropriately qualified staff are employed to undertake the work.
- A comment was made about professionalism also involving the individual having the right attitude to their work. It was acknowledged that most in the industry [both regulators and the private sector alike], want to get it right first time but there will always be those who do not. One end of the spectrum is looking to raise their game continually, which widens the gap between those at the other end, who continually fall short of this.
- Standard of work can sometimes be driven by attitudes from some clients, which can be defined as ‘Best Available Technique Not Entailing Excessive Cost’ (BATNEEC) and ‘Cheapest Available Technology Not Inviting Prosecution’ (CATNIP). Whilst the CATNIP approach was not endorsed, the commercial pressures of a recession should be recognised.

### 3.4.2 Professional Institutions

- Competency can be measured through Chartership; which itself is based on academic qualifications and experience. A poll of the different professional standards in the room was collected and the results are as follows:

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Number of ELQF Members</b>
Specialist in Land Contamination (SiLC)	4
Chartered Institute of Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM)	2
Geological Society (GeolSoc)	5
Chartered Institute of Waste Management	2

(CIWM)	
Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH)	4
Chemistry Related	2
Engineering Related	1

- A total of 27 members of the ELQF attended the event and of those with professional qualifications, five people had two or more professional qualifications.
- Some financial difficulties were noted regarding paying for membership e.g. for Contaminated Land Officers (CLO's) but most private companies appeared to support employees memberships to professional institutions.
- Changes in university courses over last 20 years has meant that there has been a move away from single discipline courses (Science, engineering) to a broader range of environmental science. Some practitioners therefore found that there is no single professional institution that would match / reflect their background and/or current activities.
- There are professional institutions who will accept membership from broad disciplines, for example CIWEM recognised that contaminated land is important and now have a Contaminated Land Network with over 400 members and you can be chartered as an environmentalist or scientist.
- Professional qualifications are recognised by some clients, necessary for some framework agreements, necessary for credibility for 'expert' opinion in legal cases
- Skills development framework – DEFRA commission a report on skills back in 2010 which is still not published but may be found in future at [www.defra.gov.uk](http://www.defra.gov.uk). National Brownfield forum were concerned there was going to be a skill shortage in the sector. Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH) and Environment Agency (EA) have them, SiLC on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency produced one (with CL:AIRE as the contractor). Other professions (accountants, surveyors etc) progress to chartered, trade organisation have registrations schemes (e.g. gas safe)
- 20 years ago not all testing laboratories were in accreditation schemes for some analyses – had internal QA/QC, no reason to suggest quality was sub-standard, but the market, regulators and the industry itself led to more accreditation schemes

### 3.4.3 Guidance

- There is a substantial amount of guidance/standards available and the group queried why professional qualifications would be needed if good guidance is always followed.

- Working with the available guidance– many competent practitioners do not have professional qualifications. NPPF requires competent practitioners – how can this be measured/checked. We need some guidance on this.

#### **3.4.4 Existing Schemes and Standards**

- One UK scheme/qualification is the Qualified Person under the CLAIRE Code of Practice which appears to be liked by industry, regulators (EA), consultants/contractors however the groups raised questions over the competency of the QP, the boundaries of their advice and procedures for if things go wrong.
- It was noted by some delegates that the regulatory framework is moving towards Self-Regulation and localism and the Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice provides an excellent example of the industry self-regulating.
- Some delegates stated that if more self-regulation may take place in future, there are existing self-regulation schemes working well in other countries – these are based on attained a professional qualification/registration
- Land forum (formerly the National Brownfield forum) was also highlighted as an organisation looking at better regulation.

## 4. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

The workshop provided an excellent forum for discussion and debate around the subject of improving standards within the contaminated land industry. The following subsections provide a summary of the key observations and conclusions drawn from the delegate groups at the end of the workshop to improve standards.

### 4.1 Report Quality

#### Common Themes

It was agreed by all that report quality in our industry can be highly variable. Some reports are of a high standard and, when they are, they are often from a small number of consistently high performers. Common threads running through poor reports typically include inconsistency and unclear content with conflicting data and/or opinion. It was felt that these problems often arise through a lack of care and time given to a report and/or a report that tries to be everything for everyone and ends up falling a long way short as a result. Competency of report writers was also a recurring theme (addressed below under Professional Standards).

#### Report Writing versus Report Reading

It was universally agreed that the way in which reports are read is rarely, if ever, the way they are written. In the main, reports are written in the order in which work was undertaken whereas they are typically read like a newspaper (front and back pages first and potentially nothing more). If we wrote them with this focus in mind, and perhaps even in this order, then the investment given to these 'first impressions' might be repaid by making the details inside the report, which are by their nature harder to write and more complex to explain, more accessible via clearer summaries and headlines.

#### Report Templates

Regarding report templates it was agreed that these have pros and cons. The advantage is that they prompt the writer to ask questions and provide answers in a structured fashion. The disadvantage is that it may create a false sense of security by offering wording that may be too readily accepted without being adequately thought through. Generic conceptual site models (CSMs) and generic risk assessments were mentioned as potential pitfalls for report writers and in particular when using templates. CSMs and risk assessments need to characterise the individual site (with an appropriate allowance for uncertainty) or they are worthless.

#### Caveats

A highly caveated report is of little value to anyone. Report writers are paid to offer opinions and direction, so when text contains a lot of qualifying words the value of what is being said rapidly diminishes and in fact may become totally opaque!

## 4.2 Professional Standards

### Code of Practice

A key and repeated theme within this topic was one of competency. What is it and how do we measure and assess it? What are the outcomes that enable us to recognise it? Much of the discussion here centred around Code(s) of Practice and the desire amongst members for the contaminated land industry to have such a code, similar perhaps to the Waste Code of Practice. Some discussion was also had regarding the political landscape and how current Government direction to emphasise localism and decentralisation may lead to fragmentation and undermine the fundamental need in our contaminated land industry for co-ordination and co-operation.

### Professional Standards and Professionalism

Further questions and discussion arose on whether a Code of Practice would ever deliver professionalism, since compliance with a code is all very well but it doesn't in itself engender qualities such as vision, curiosity and tenacity, all of which (and more) are qualities we often look or hope for (whether we realise it or not) when seeking professional advice from (say) doctors, lawyers and/or accountants. Without accessing and nurturing the motivations we had for entering our profession in the first place it is unlikely standards of professionalism, let alone professional standards, will improve in practice.

### Professional Memberships

It was notable that several attendees felt there was no professional body that represented their interests nor provided an appropriate route to gain chartership. At face value this view appeared more common amongst Environmental Health Officers and laboratory staff than other professionals present. Whether this was because of a lack of awareness or a genuine gap in the 'market' was not explored on this occasion. Either way, this perception highlighted a potential area for action (see below) in terms of ELQF engagement with other professional bodies.

### Absent Friends

It was also felt that the workshop, whilst valuable, was engaging with the 'converted' and that many of the people who we really needed to be present, such as developers and constructors, were in fact absent. As above, this highlighted a probable need for wider engagement within our region if we are to see an improvement in professional standards.

## 5. PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE

This section provides a summary of the actions and suggestions proposed at the ELQF workshop to improve standards. The details of the group discussions and results as presented in this report will be sent to CL:AIRE and the Land Forum for their consideration and comment.

### 5.2.1 Report Quality

#### Generic Checklist to Stimulate Focussed Response

It is recognised that technical checklists are available in industry, such as the Guiding Principals for Land Contamination (GPLC) published by the Environment Agency at the following link:

<http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/PDF/GEHO1109BRHA-E-E.pdf>

The ELQF will therefore circulate this checklist to the delegate members that attended the workshop for their comment however it is recognised that more qualitative aspects to reporting will need to be included, based upon the discussions.

If appropriate, or at the request of its members, the ELQF could post a final checklist on its website for members to download if they wished, albeit on the understanding that they remain the responsible for their report content.

#### Publicly Available Generic Feedback

A further suggestion, building on the identified need to maintain and develop communication on this topic arises from the notion that our regulators are fundamentally custodians of our report standards. If feedback from regulators on the quality of reports is provided to developers and their agents, *as well as* some generic feedback to the land quality industry as a whole (protecting commercial confidences) then over time, reporting may in itself be seen as a more valuable service rather than a commoditised entity to get a developer through the planning system. For example, how many reports do regulators get to see each week / month? Of these how many were good, satisfactory or poor and why?

Simple statistics like these with some commentary for wider dissemination, say as a regular slot at each ELQF meeting, could be used to promote the regulators' role in reviewing reports as well as keeping the areas which are most commonly arising as problems high up on our agenda.

#### Wider Engagement

If the above feedback were to be reported via ELQF meetings and/or our website then it would only work for those organisations and individuals engaged with the ELQF. Wider engagement with the land quality industry was a key theme arising from our discussions on Professional Standards (see below).

## **5.2.2 Professional Standards**

### Code of Practice

In response to the desire expressed by many attendees for a Code of Practice for Contaminated Land to define competency requirements; similar that outlined in the CDM Regulations. This could include a roadmap / pathway for the entire range of disciplines working in our industry, from site workers, drillers up to Technical Directors. The ELQF can make enquiries to SiLC Professional and Technical Panel regarding who if anyone is looking into this topic for contaminated land professionals, what progress has been made and what are the challenges and opportunities. Any response will be fed back to the ELQF members at the next meeting or via its website.

### Wider Engagement

In order to engage the wider community, the ELQF will seek opinion from its members on whether to hold joint meetings with SiLC/Geological Society/CIWEM/NHBC/RICS to explore the possibility of wider cooperation in different industries.

## ANNEX 1: LIST OF ATTENDEES

First Name:	Last Name:	Company:	Job Title:
Gavin	Allsopp	NHBC	Senior Environmental Engineer
Peter	Atchison	PAGeotechnical ltd	Director
Bill	Baker	Independent Environmental consultant	Sole trader
Murray	Bateman	Lister Geotechnics	Geologist
Alex	Brearley	agb Environmental	Managing Director
Eric	Cooper	Hydrock Consultants	Technical Director
Ruth	Copeland-Phillips	The University of Northampton	Principal Lecturer
Amanda	David	Listers Geotechnical Consultants	Technical Director
Mandy	Dennis	East Northamptonshire Council	Environmental Protection Officer
Trevor	Dixon	South Northants Council	EHO
Kevin	Eaton	MJCA	Technical Director
Julie	Ewers	South Northants Council	Environmental Health Officer
David	Grant	ALcontrol Laboratories	Business Development Manager
Alex	Gratrix	Kettering Borough Council	Team Leader (Environmental Protection)
Lisa	Hathway	NHBC	Principal Land Quality Engineer
Alison	Hukin	Environment Agency	Project Manager
Keith	Jones	Chemtest Ltd	Technical Manager
Marian	Markham	Halcrow Group Ltd	Senior Geoenvironmental Scientist
Andy	McParland	Health Protection Agency	Environmental Public Health Scientist
Fabia	Pollard	BC King's Lynn & West Norfolk	Contaminated Land Co-ordinator
Duncan	Russell	Royal Haskoning	Director of Hydrogeology
Andy	Spetch	british sugar	manager
Claire	Sproats	South Cambridgeshire Distict Council	Contaminated Land Officer
Martin	Stride	Pick Everard	Environmental Engineer
Nicola	Todd	Corby Borough Council	Environmental Protection Officer
Callum	Ward	LBH WEMBLEY Geotechnical & Environmental	
Shaun	Wedgwood	Augean plc	

# ANNEX 2: COPY OF THE PRESENTATION

## Slide 1

### Background

Areas identified as pitfalls/problems by ELQF members:

- 34% Science issues, especially risk assessment
- 24% Report quality, especially conceptual site model
- 17% Interpretation of legislation & regulations
- 10% Experience / competence of practitioners
- 10% Duplication and gaps between regulators
- 5% Waste Management Mistakes

Based on 58 respondents @ 27 March 2012

## Slide 2

### Response

Based on members feedback ELQF Steering Committee identified three common and reoccurring themes currently needing to be addressed (today and in future)

- Improving Report Quality
- Improving Professional Standards
- Improving Communication

If this was simple there wouldn't be any issues! Culture and co-operation are vital and need to be cultivated!

## Slide 3

### Format

10.00-11.30 Discussion Sessions

- 1) Improving Report Quality  
SG Facilitators: **Red Group** - Gavin Allsopp  
**Green Group** - Alex Brearley
- 2) Improving Professional Standards  
SG Facilitators: **Blue Group** - Alison Hukin  
**Orange Group** - Mandy Dennis

11.30-11.45 Refreshments

11.45-13.00 Feedback & Summary

## Slide 4

### Topic Taster #1

Improving Report Quality (Red & Green Groups)  
NB. Agree Group Feedbackers!

Starter questions:

- Think of the good reports you've read / written
- What made them good and for whom were they good and why?
- Is the way we write a report the same way we read a report?
- Should it be, if so why, if not why not?
- How do we make sure a CSM is realistic and not alarmist?
- How do we address uncertainty within a CSM?

## Slide 5

### Topic Taster #2

Improving Professional Standards (Blue & Orange Groups)  
NB. Agree Group Feedbackers!

Starter questions:

- In a world full of so called experts what does accreditation mean?
- How do we safeguard in the long term what we value today?
- Professional standard or professionalism? Is there a difference?
- What motivates us to be professionals in the first place?
- What do we expect from other professions when we seek advice?
- Are these standards reflected in our own work?
- Is a professional standard an absolute standard?

## Slide 6

### Feedback Session

For each topic, each feedbacker to provide a 5 minute (approx.) summary of their group's discussion, highlighting:

- Three key observations
- Three key recommendations / actions to carry forward

Followed by:

- Questions and discussion to follow feedback on each topic
- Up to 15 minutes Q&A per topic

NB Feedback should be generic and applicable at a variety of levels, such as individual, team and organisation. The ELQF Steering Committee will use this to help plan forthcoming events. Individuals may also wish to discuss the same with their managers.